system, under the cultural park category. Such designation would ensure that the unique story contained in the Lowell experience may be made available to all people. I might add that this is the designation given to the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Virginia, an addition to the national park system with which many of my colleagues are pleasantly familiar.

Lowell is without question distinctly qualified for this classification. In the year of our bicentennial, Lowell will be 150 years old. In its early years it played a vital role in what many people regard as America's most important historical movement: the industrial revolution. Its five miles of canals serviced the most productive textile mills in the country. And to these mills came so many people with so many wonderfully divergent ethnic backgrounds. The result is a city with a unique cultural heritage—a heritage I believe the Congress should make every effort to preserve.

Unfortunately, the pace of American life has all but left behind these industrial giants of the Nineteenth Century. Modern technology has brought on a new industrial revolution which all too often discards or ignores the industrial underpinnings of our past.

Lowell is a prime victim of this rush into the future. Its giant textile mills which had proudly paced the country in textile production now lie silent. Its bustling economy now suffers one of the nation's highest unemployment rates. And while its ethnic diversity thrives, its population declines.

Yet, the citizens of Lowell have not succumbed to this adversity. Rather they have enthusiastically banded together to revitalize their city—using their rich past as their solid foundation.

And as I have said many times, Mr. Chairman, herein lies the beauty of the measure before us today. On the one hand, it offers the citizens of this country a unique glimpse of our industrial past—a glimpse made all the more important because of the approaching bicentennial—while on the other hand it offers the citizens of Lowell a base on which to build a new future.

The proposal calls for the restoration and beautification of the old canal system; the reactivation of one of the mills, complete with Eighteenth Century looms; technological exhibits and museums; and the recreation of an early settlement and/or Indian village. These attributes make a compelling case for congressional approval of this legislation, Mr. Chairman.

The significance and extent of these historic attributes will doubtless be expanded in the near future. I have been informed by the Director of the Park Service, Mr. Ronald Walker, than an extensive historical survey is now underway in Lowell. In his letter, Mr. Walker wrote:

"We are pleased to inform you that the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), one of the continuing programs administered by the National Park Service, is conducting a recording survey in Lowell, Massachusetts, this summer to document significant historic engineering and industrial works. Like other surveys by the HAER, the current project will produce measured drawings, professional photographs, historical monographs, and technical analyses which ultimately will be deposited in the Library of Congress where they will be made available to the public."

Indicative of the local support for preservation is the list of cosponsors of the summer survey. According to Director Walker these following groups are participating: The City of Lowell, Human Services Corporation, Historical Commission of the City of Lowell, City Development Authority, Proprietors of the Locks and Canals on Merrimack River, Lowell Technological Institute, and the Lowell Historical Society.

And as a further endorsement of the soundness of this legislative proposal, I would like to pass along one other comment of the Park Service Director, who wrote:

"The power and transportation canal system in Lowell will serve as the primary focus for the HAER recording team. The system is of clear national significance and is remarkably preserved. The records produced by the project should make an important contribution to our understanding of American technological and industrial development."

Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted, I would like to close on a personal note. I had the very fortunate experience of growing up in the one city which is marvelously served by the National Park Service: Washington, D.C. Rock Creek Park, the C & O Canal, and a host of lesser known but important parklands make this city the beautiful, livable city that we know today.

This is the way it should be in all our cities. And we in the Congress, acting in conjunction with the National Park Service, can bring to our cities the wonderful experiences of national parks—experiences which all too often our urban populations are unable to enjoy. The bill before us today is a step in this direction.

But it also represents a far more important step. As we become more aware of our great heritage we become increasingly aware of the role that cities have played in this history. To keep pace with this awareness, the Congress must begin the difficult but rewarding task of identifying those urban areas which will illuminate for generations to come the critical role that cities have played in our national development.

Early and favorable consideration of the bill before us today will ensure that the great role played by Lowell and its people will be forever etched in our nation's conscience.

S. 3974

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of preserving and interpreting for the educational and inspirational benefit of present and future generations the unique and significant contribution to our national heritage of certain historic and cultural lands, waterways, and edifices in the City of Lowell, Massachusetts (the cradle of the industrial revolution in America as well as America's first planned industrial city) with emphasis on harnessing this unique urban environment for its educational value as well as for recreation, there is hereby established the Lowell Historic Canal District Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), the purpose of which shall be to prepare and implement a plan for the preservation, interpretation, development and use, by public and private entities, of the historic, cultural, and architectural resources of the Lowell Historic Canal District in the City of Lowell, Massachusetts.

SEC. 2(a). The Commission shall consist of nine members, as follows:

(1) The Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Secretary of Commerce, all ex officio; and

(2) Five members appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, one of whom shall be the Director of the National Park Service, two of whom shall be appointed from recommendations submitted by the Mayor of the City of Lowell, and two of whom shall be appointed from recommendations submitted by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The members appointed pursuant to this paragraph shall have knowledge and experience in one or more of the fields of history, architecture, the arts, recreation planning, city planning, or government.

(b) Each member of the Commission specified in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and the Director of the National Park Service may designate an alternate official to serve in his stead. Members appointed pursuant to paragraph (2) of subsection (a) who are officers or employees of the Federal government, the City of Lowell or the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, shall serve without compensation as such. Other members, when engaged in activities of the Commission, shall be entitled to compensation at the rate of not to exceed $100 per diem. All members of the Commission shall receive reimbursement for necessary travel and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

SEC. 3(a). The Commission shall elect a Chairman from among its members. Financial and administrative services (including those relating to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) shall be provided by the Commission by the Department of the Interior, for which payments shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided,* That the regulations of the Department of the Interior for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Secretary for the administrative control of funds shall apply to appropriations of the Commission: *And provided further,* That the Commission shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

(b) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out its duties, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

(c) The Commission may also procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the executive departments by secion 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, but at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals.

(d) The members of the Commission specified in paragraph (1) of section 2(a) shall provide the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, with such facilities and services under their jurisdiction and control as may be needed by the Commission to carry out its duties, to the extent that such facilities and services are requested by the Commission and are otherwise available for that purpose. To the extent of available appropriations, the Commission may obtain, by purchase, rental, donation, or otherwise, such additional property, facilities, and services as may be needed to carry out its duties. Upon the termination of the Commission all property, personal and real, and unexpended funds shall be transferred to the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare the plan referred to in the first section of this Act, and to submit the plan together with any recommendations for additional legislation, to the Congress not later than two years from the effective date of this Act. The plan for the Lowell Historic Canal District shall include considerations and recommendations, without limitation, regarding (1) the objectives to be achieved by the establishment, development and operation of the area; (2) the types of use, both public and private, to be accommodated; (3) criteria for the design and appearance of buildings, facilities, open spaces and other improvements; (4) a program for the staging of development; (5) the anticipated interpretive, cultural and recreational programs and uses for the area; (6) the proposed ownership and operation of all structures, facilities and lands; (7) areas where cooperative agreements may be anticipated; (8) esti-

mates of costs, both public and private, of implementing the plan; and (9) procedures to be used in implementing and insuring continuing conformance to the plan.

SEC. 5(a) If either the Senate or House of Representatives has not, within 60 legislative days following the submission of the plan prepared by the Commission to the Congress, disapproved the plan by resolution, the Commission may proceed with the implementation of the plan in the manner set forth therein and in accordance with the authorities hereinafter provided. If, within such 60 legislative day period either the Senate or House of Representatives disapproves by resolution any portion of the plan, the Commission may not proceed as to that portion which is disapproved. In the event of any disapproval of the plan in whole or in part, the Commission may, within 60 calendar days, resubmit to the Congress appropriate revisions, which revisions shall be acted upon in the same manner as provided in this Section for the initial submission of the plan itself.

(b) The Commission shall be dissolved (1) upon the termination, as determined by its members, of need for its continued existence for the implementation of the plan and the operation or coordination of the entity established by the plan, or (2) upon expiration of a two-year period commencing on the effective date of this Act, whereupon the completed plan has not been submitted to the Congress, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 6. In proceeding with the implementation of the plan the Commission shall—

(1) acquire lands and interests therein within the Lowell Historic Canal District by purchase, lease, donation, or exchange;

(2) hold, maintain, use, develop, or operate buildings, facilities, and any other properties;

(3) sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of real or personal property as necessary to carry out the plan;

(4) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions with any agency or instrumentality of the United States, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and any governmental unit within its boundaries, or any person, firm, association, or corporation as may be necessary;

(5) establish (through covenants, regulations, agreements, or otherwise) such restrictions, standards, and requirements as are necessary to assure development, maintenance, use, and protection of the Lowell Historic Canal District in accordance with the plan; and

(6) borrow money from the Treasury of the United States in such amounts as may be authorized in appropriation Acts on the basis of obligations issued by the Commission in accordance with terms and conditions approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any such obligations of the Commission.

SEC. 7. Title to property of the Commission shall be in the name of the Commission, but it shall not be subject to any Federal, State, or municipal taxes.

SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the development of the plan to be prepared pursuant to this Act.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

S. 2801

At the request of Mr. PROXMIRE, the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2801, a bill to prevent the Food and Drug Administration from regulating safe vitamins as dangerous drugs.

S. 3305

At the request of Mr. CLARK, the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK) were added as cosponsors of S. 3305, the National Huntington's Disease Control Act.

S. 3357

At the request of Mr. BURDICK, the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3357, a bill to restore to Federal civilian employees their rights to participate, as private citizens, in the political life of the Nation, and for other purposes.

S. 3465

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3465, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act.

S. 3492

At the request of Mr. BROCK, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3492, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status in the granting of credit.

S. 3524

At the request of Mr. HUGH SCOTT, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3524, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to permit the mailing, broadcasting, or televising of lottery information and the transportation, mailing, and advertising of lottery tickets in interstate commerce but only concerning lotteries which are lawful.

S. 3869

At the request of Mr. HARTKE, the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3869, a bill to notify employees when Federal installations are scheduled to be closed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 110

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 110 relating to the situation in Cyprus.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 1850

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. ABOUREZK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to S. 3394, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, the tragedy of Cyprus, a tragedy not yet finished, has brought with it, as have other crises, accusations that the United States has some responsibility for or at least knew about the plans leading up to the bloody events still taking place.

As we in the Congress now try to understand the situation on that small Mediterranean island, and formulate a response, we must analyze first the history of Cyprus itself, as well as U.S. ties to Turkey and Greece, both of whom have military and political presence on Cyprus.

The history of Cyprus consists of a series of occupations: by Alexander the Great, the Roman Empire, Richard the Lionhearted, Guy de Lusignan of France, the Republic of Venice, the Ottoman Empire, and finally that of Great Britain, which withdrew its rule when in 1960 the Cypriots won their struggle for independence.

Most of the island's population is of Greek origin dating back from the earliest occupations; and a minority, about 18 percent, is of Turkish descent, dating mostly from the occupation of the Ottoman Empire which began in the 16th century.

The British, Turkish, and Greek agreement in 1960 meant that the momentous task of social, economic, and political unification of Cyprus would now be undertaken by Cypriots—headed by Archbishop Makarios, the only elected leader of Cyprus to date.

The divisions at that time, exacerbated by foreign interests, ran deep but not impossibly deep. Some of the Greek Cypriots demanded union with Greece and felt that the Turkish minority had disproportionate power. A Greek Cypriot right wing underground group, EOKA, formed by General Grivas in the early fifties to drive both British and Turks out of Cyprus, has continued its campaign of terror against President Makarios through the sixties and seventies; at least two attempts on the life of the President have been made by this group.

In addition to the problems posed by Grivas' Fascists, some Turkish Cypriots demanded union with Turkey. While the greatest part of the Cypriot people and its government struggled on over the last 15 years for the unification and neutrality of Cyprus, extremists carried out illegal actions to undermine that majority's will. In spite of that, Makarios remained the only leader who could hold the people's confidence, and move toward the ambitious task of forming out of a culturally divided island, beset by foreign meddling, a politically independent society that could work toward economic self-sufficiency and cultural identity.

A small minority of Cypriots continue pressing demands to make Cyprus into either Greek or Turkish property. As we have just witnessed, annexation only leads to war on Cyprus. The neutral and independent state suffered first a right-wing military coup carried out and led by Greek national guardsmen who drove the democratically elected President Makarios into exile, and then suffered the Turkish reaction to that coup, a bloody and callous invasion. Throughout the world people mourn not only the death and pain of displacement suffered by the Cypriot people, but despair for the fallen ideal. Cyprus, from a long and conquered past, has risen to construct an inspired present only to be trampled again.

Now as we grope for a reaction, one

appropriate for the most powerful country in the world, we must ask once again as we have had to do in the light of the CIA role in Chile: What is our responsibility in the attempted coup and in the ensuing bloodbath on Cyprus?

Here are the basic facts of our relationships with Greece and Turkey: First, the United States has supported the military dictatorships which have ruled Greece through force and torture since 1967. The aid has been mostly in military and police benefits for successive regimes which have shown little interests in material or social benefits for the Greek people. Second, the United States has also supplied Turkey with military hardware for many years, with the result that Turkey is actually superior to Greece in arms preparedness, efficiency, and amount of weaponry. Both countries belong to NATO, supposedly an alliance of free world states against Communist aggression. Both countries have routinely used torture against their own citizens during their years of NATO membership. Third, various attempts have been made by the Greek secret police, often called the Greek CIA, so closely are the two agencies tied, to assassinate Archbishop Makarios.

Eric Rouleau, a journalist for the French newspaper Le Monde, claims that the latest plan against Makarios was formulated by General Ioannides of the Greek junta together with a CIA agent of Greek origin by the name of Coron, and that for the action they used 1,000 careful chosen Greek national guardsmen stationed in Cyprus, as well as members of EOKA-B who, according to Rouleau and other sources, are financed, armed, and infiltrated by both the Greek secret police and the CIA.

It is further claimed, by Mr. Ioannis Zigdis, a Greek centrist and former minister under Papandreou who has just returned to Greece from years of exile in Washington, that our Department of State and its Secretary were aware of the coup plot beforehand, and that the plot was complementary to rather than in conflict with the Nixon-Kissinger doctrine. A map of the Mediterranean suggests the geopolitical importance of Cyprus. We must ask ourselves, given our close ties with the former Greek junta, how U.S. officials could not have known about the plot against Makarios? How, given the scope of U.S. intelligence over the globe, U.S. officials could not have known the comparative strength of Turkish forces? How could they have been unable to predict a Turkish reaction to the Greek coup d'etat? And we must ask, if U.S. officials did have foreknowledge of the coup in Cyprus, why there was not the most strenuous effort to prevent it? Once again with the memories of the bloody Chilean coup fresh in mind, we are forced to question our State Department's policy when a democratically elected President is overthrown by a group over whom we have considerable influence.

What illusion was the Greek junta under when it overthrew Makarios? It had to know that the action would provoke Turkey, a country with known military superiority. Hundreds of Greek Cypriots shouted "Betrayer!" to U.S. Ambassador Davies the day he was murdered—did they expect that the United States would protect them from the invading Turks? Was our Secretary of State surprised when Greece announced its withdrawal from an active part in NATO?

Our ties with Greece gave us great influence in its politics. We did not exert that influence when we had foreknowledge of the coup plan. Our donor's relationship with Turkey gives us some leverage to curb their continued military thrust. But we have said little and done nothing about their aggression against the Cypriot people.

Once again we witness the consequences of secret diplomacy that depends on the wisdom of a handful of people. When they are unwise we bear the moral responsibility for their actions, and in other parts of the world other people bear the brunt of those actions.

As an alternative to the posture of an inept giant helplessly watching a bloody brawl, the amendment my colleagues and I are submitting today is aimed at withdrawing all economic and military assistance to Turkey until an agreement is reached which is acceptable to Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey. Since Greece's new government does not hold responsibility for the actions of last summer and so far demonstrates no territorial ambitions on Cyprus, and furthermore is scheduled for only $71 million total for fiscal year 1975 compared with Turkey's $232 million, the amendment deals only with Turkey. If the situation were different I feel sure that any legislation proposed by us would include sanctions against Greece as well.

It is our sense and intention that the amendment encourage moves toward the reinstatement of a neutral and independent Cyprus, governed by Cypriots.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY AMENDMENTS OF 1974—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 1851.

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. President, today the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) and I are submitting an amendment to S. 3934, the Federal-Aid Highway Amendments of 1974. I send it to the desk and ask that it be printed.

Mr. President, by way of introduction I would like to explain to my colleagues that this amendment is a substitute for S. 3840, a bill that Senator EAGLETON and I introduced in July of this session. This amendment is simply a more comprehensive version of S. 3840.

Mr. President, the intent of our amendment to S. 3934, the Federal-Aid Highway Amendments of 1974, is to revoke the Federal motor vehicle safety standard which requires a safety belt interlock and buzzer system in new automobiles. Briefly stated, our amendment provides the following:

First. Upon enactment of the provision it would repeal the Department of Transportation standard requiring a safety belt interlock system and buzzer system as mandatory equipment on new automobiles.

Second. It would continue the standard which requires that seat belts be provided in every new car and would permit the Department to also require a warning light to indicate that seat belts should be fastened.

Third. It would require that any new standard other than those mentioned in paragraph 2 would have to be approved by the House and Senate Commerce Committees after public hearings had been held.

Fourth. It would authorize owners of automobiles already equipped with interlock and buzzer systems to disconnect these systems.

What prompted me to alter my position and address the issue of passive restraints—air bags, and so forth—was the realization that if we were successful in revoking the mandate of an interlock and buzzer, Congress would have left the Department of Transportation with only one realistic option—that is, to push for the mandate of an air bag as an occupant restraint system. I thus did not want to be responsible for forcing upon the consumer an air bag whose estimated cost runs from $200 to $300 per copy, while attempting to lift from the shoulders of the American citizen the interlock and buzzers which cost between $50 and $100 per vehicle.

At the same time, I felt that Congress should not place itself in the position of writing safety standards with respect to air bags. I feel that it would be rather precipitous for Congress to go on record for or against air bags given the fact that four major U.S. manufacturers have already stated that at least 3 additional years will be needed to meet the specifications for passive restraints. I feel that the state of the arts with respect to air bags is such that it would be impractical, unreasonable, and inappropriate for Congress to assert itself at this time by legislating standards. Such technical problems as now exist with the air bag system should more appropriately be explored jointly by both the Department of Transportation and the auto manufacturers.

Mr. President, I feel that the amendment submitted today by the Senator from Missouri and myself effectively deals with the controversial issue of air bags for it would require that any new standard dealing with occupant restraints would have to first undergo public hearings and then be subject to approval by both the Senate and House Commerce Committees.

Given that the air bag system is expected to impact on the consumer in the amount of between $3 to $5 billion and considering the fact that research and development are not far enough advanced realistically for DOT to mandate their installation in all size vehicles, I feel confident that in this instance final congressional review and approval of such regulations prior to enactment is not only warranted but extremely desirable.

Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is inadvertently absent, and I ask that remarks he prepared for delivery today be printed in the RECORD following the text of our amendment.

There being no objection, the amendment and statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1851

On page 26, after line 14, insert the following:

AUTOMOBILE SAFETY STANDARDS

SEC. 123. Section 103(a) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 is amended by inserting "(1)" after "SEC. 103. (a)" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2)(A) Effective with respect to motor vehicles manufactured after the date of enactment of this paragraph, Federal motor vehicle safety standards may not (except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (B)) require that any such vehicle be equipped (i) with a safety belt interlock system, (ii) with any warning device other than a warning light designed to indicate that safety belts should be fastened, or (iii) with any occupant restraint system other than integrated lap and shoulder safety belts for front outboard occupants and lap belts for other occupants.

"(B) Effective with respect to motor vehicles manufactured after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall not promulgate any Federal motor vehicle safety standard requiring any occupant restraint system, or warning system in connection therewith, except as authorized in subparagraph (A), until after public hearings with respect thereto and approval of the proposed standard by resolution of the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the United States House of Representatives.

"(C) Notwithstanding any provision of Federal law to the contrary any safety belt interlock system or audible warning device in connection with safety belts may be rendered inoperative to the extent such system or device was required by a Federal motor vehicle safety standard promulgated prior to enactment of this paragraph.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS F. EAGLETON

CONGRESS SHOULD REVIEW AIR BAGS

Mr. President, Senator Buckley and myself are submitting an amendment to S. 3934, the Federal-Aid Highway Amendments of 1974.

Mr. President, this amendment is a modified version of S. 3840 which would revoke eixsting Federal motor vehicle standards requiring a safety belt interlock and buzzer systems in new automobiles.

Briefly, the amendment will provide the following:

1. Upon enactment of the provision it would repeal the Department of Transportation standard requiring a safety belt interlock system and buzzer system as mandatory equipment on new automobiles.

2. It would continue the standard which requires that seat belts be provided in every new car and would permit the Department to also require a warning light to indicate that seat belts should be fastened.

3. It would require that any new standard other than those mentioned in paragraph two would have to be approved by the House and Senate Commerce Committees after public hearings.

4. It would authorize owners of automobiles already equipped with interlock and buzzer systems to disconnect these systems.

The amendment is different from the original bill principally in that it would require Senate and House Committees approval of any future occupant restraint system standard before it takes effect.

Mr. President, it is not enough that Congress undo the problems created by past, ill-conceived safety regulations. It should assure the American people that no similar standards will be promulgated in the future without a full public hearing and congressional review.

Even before final congressional action to revoke the interlock and buzzer standards, the Department of Transportation has begun pushing for a mandatory air bag system beginning with 1977 model cars.

Mr. President, as a personal matter, I believe there is impressive evidence that the air bag can save lives and prevent injuries. But before we permit the Department to require installation of such a system on all new cars, at an estimated cost of about $300 per copy, I believe those who have questioned the effectiveness of the system should be given an opportunity to present their views and to suggest alternative systems for the consideration of the two congressional committees concerned.

In short, having been burned by the interlock and buzzer systems, the American people and the Congress want to be darned sure it dosen't happen again. If we are going to add $300 to the price of new cars which is already $500-$600 above last year's sticker prices, we had better know what we are doing. We had better know that there is not a cheaper way of providing the same protection.

This provision of the Buckley-Eagleton amendment differs from the provision recently adopted by the House. The House amendment seeks to preclude the air bag as mandatory equipment on automobiles, requiring that such equipment can be offered only as an option to seat belts.

Our amendment seeks to avoid the pitfall of trying to write standards which are highly technical and better left to the experts. Instead, it provides for final congressional review and approval of such regulations before they can take effect and I think we owe that much to the American people.

Mr. President, an editorial in the *Wall Street Journal* today makes the important point that regulations such as those requiring the interlock and buzzer systems are not only expensive to consumers but harmful to the overall goal of auto safety.

The editorial states:

"This kind of overreaching regulation is not merely expensive, but dangerous to the cause it tries to serve. Policies that insult and annoy the public had at least better deliver the claimed benefits, or they will give even the cause of safety a bad name."

With our new provision, Senator Buckley and I are attempting to salvage the good cause of safety by assuring that we do not have a repetition of the interlock and buzzer situation. The only way that can be done, short of requiring Congress to write the standard itself, is to provide for a review procedure and that is what our amendment does.

Mr. President, I ask that my letter to the Wall Street Journal's editorial response be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

[Letters to the Editor]

SENATOR EAGLETON RESPONDS

Editor, The Wall Street Journal:

As sponsor of a bill in the Senate to make seatbelt interlocks and buzzers optional rather than mandatory, I must take exception to the points raised in your editorial "Regulatory Overkill" (Aug. 15). While you state that the buzzer is ample inducement to buckle-up and the interlock system "simply a gratuitous insult and annoyance," the evidence is all to the contrary.

The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, in the most professional study of the subject yet undertaken, found that there was no significant increase in seatbelt use in cars equipped with lights and buzzers relative to those without such equipment. They concluded that buzzers were "a public health failure." Moreover, for 1974 model cars equipped with interlocks, there was a substantial increase in seatbelt usage. Well over half of the drivers observed, however, had partially or completely circumvented the systems, only two-thirds of the way through the model year. As time goes on, undoubtedly more of these interlocks will be disconnected.

Under my bill, these interlocks and buzzers would still have to be offered by manufacturers as optional equipment, and no position is taken on the as-yet unproven passive restraint systems. Lap and shoulder belts would, of course, continue to be mandatory. But the interlocks and buzzers are a clear example of where the federal government has attempted to impose its will on the decisions of an individual which affect only himself. Furthermore, it is an attempt which has failed at a not inconsiderable cost to the public in terms of time, money and aggravation.

THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
United States Senate.

[Senator Eagleton's report on seatbelt usage is correct. A further editorial on the subject appears today.—Ed.]

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK AMENDMENTS OF 1974—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1852 AND 1853

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments to S. 3917, the Export-Import Bank authority extension bill. Both of my measures were previously introduced as amendments to S. 3660.

My first amendment was initially introduced on June 18, 1974, and would absolutely prohibit any Export-Import Bank investment in fossil fuel energy research, exploration, or production activities in Communist countries. I recognize that S. 3917 contains restrictions in this area which are not in current law; nevertheless, I believe Congress should take decisive action to remove all uncertainty and insure there is no Siberian energy deal. My amendment would provide that assurance.

My second amendment was initially introduced on July 8, 1974, and is cosponsored by Senator CANNON. It will require that all Eximbank direct loans be made at the prevailing market rate for loans of comparable maturity. S. 3917 contains general language requiring that the Bank "supplement and encourage, and not compete with, private capital;" nevertheless, the Bank has made it clear that its direct loan interest rates will not exceed 8½ percent, even when many businesses are forced to pay 12 percent, 15 percent, or even more for private loans. My amendment is, therefore, essential to stop the Bank from siphoning off massive amounts of capital from the already hard-pressed private market, for the purpose of making cutrate loans. The American taxpayer should not be forced to subsidize the 4 percent of all U.S. exports which qualify for cutrate Eximbank loans, and my amendment will end this subsidy.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amend-